few photographs of him, and each one makes him look sort of "nutty". Maybe I am wrong, but I wonder if these photos were diliberately selected for publication in order to pre-prejudice the public into thinking: "this guy even looks like a nut, so whatever he says shouldn't be taken seriously." But, upon reading his complete testimony, this fellow Lane is anything but a crack-pot. He made excellent points with the facts then available, and after completing your book, and comparing yours with Popkin's, as you suggested, I hope to secure Lane's.

To your knowledge, has anyone ever tracked down "William Seymour" from Arizona, who evidentally misrepresented himself to Mrs. Odio as Oswald? What was done about Loran Eugene Hall, in this connection? (154 of your book.) If Seymour was with Hall when he claimed to be Oswald, then

2905 Longshore Ave.
Phila. Pa. 19149
October 16, 1966

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

Many thanks for your latest letter, and I am excited at your suggestion that I make a comparison of your book to "The Second Oswald." To answer your question specifically, I would be delighted to engage in the "intellectual excercise" of such a comparison.

The business of seeking employment has prevented me from continuing your book — especially since I did not realize you were anxious that I finish it "soon". Today, I got back to it, and at this point have found no errors up to page 155. I believe in my last letter, I had gotten to page 124. I did find one or two slight typographical errors, such as the spelling of "also" on the second line of

the previous one, and the camera would have to be absolutely stationery on a tripod, also. It couldn't be done directly from the book, for that reason.

Now, to tell you how I finally got access to the 26 volumes. I will tell you because it may help me to be of service to you if you reprint "Whitewash". I will make a tentative offer, and leave it up to you.

As you know, I have been out of work for two months, and the reason I have read so little of "Whitewash" since last writing to you is because I have been looking for work. Well, I have just found a job. It is not much of a job, and the pay is only $72., but I am in desperate need of money — I already owe nearly two months back "board" money alone to my parents — so I took the job, regardless of the

Surely Hall should undergo some pretty exhaustive investigations!

As for "eyewitnesses", did you ever notice how invalid "eyewitness" descriptions are? In "The Witnesses", which is the New York Times condensation of some of the testimony, I long ago read both Jackie Kennedy's and Governor Connelly's testimony. My recollection is that Mrs. Kennedy said she was not looking at her husband at the time he was shot, and that this particularly bothered her because otherwise she might have had the opportunity of grabbing him after the first shot, and prevent his having been hit by the fatal shot. Yet, according to the Zaprudor pictures, she was looking at him, and in fact did grab him after the first shot — but when his head slumped to her shoulder, she helped raise it,

thereby (quite accidentally, of course) putting him into the very chance position required for the fatal shot(s). Don't misconstrue this into thinking me some sort of crack-pot who is making implications — I am certainly not, for such a thing would be beyond reason. All I am saying is that it proves the unreliability of the memory of "eyewitnesses" — could Brennan be a better witness than Mrs. Kennedy?

My memory of the Connally testimony (I am not presently refering back to it, except by recollection) is that he did not turn far enough around to see the President once the firing had begun. Yet, the Zapruder pictures show him facing the President between shots. Therefore, the shock involved would seem to make "eyewitnesses" completely unable to know just what they witnessed!

I only wish I actually owned the supplementary volumes, for if I did, I would try to have the frames (bad as the reprints are) copied somehow — and then I would either try to rephotograph them directly onto movie film by using single-frame shots, or else simply cut each reprint to the same size, put them in order, and "flip" them, to "see" the actual event taking place. My old movie camera can take single frame shots, but I don't know if it could reproduce such small pictures — and certainly it couldn't do this unless I first had copies, for it would be impossible to line each photo up correctly by using the book, itself. First, the photos from the book would have to be duplicated, so that the duplicates could be placed on a stationery frame, one by one, so that each would be in the exact position as

assassination, and you did not answer. I'm curious enough to also wonder, although I wouldn't blame you for not putting an answer in a letter.

Before the Kennedy murder, I was deeply interested in the Lincoln assassination, and especially in the books by Eisenschimle (probably mispelled) and Roscoe's "The Web of Conspiracy", which to this day I have been unable to find in a bookstore, but which I borrowed, then returned. He was published, but <u>someone</u> prevented any further printings after the very first edition. I thought <u>he</u> was treated unfairly until I learned what happened in your case! At least Prentice-Hall put out <u>one</u> edition of Roscoe's book before suppressing it!

If you have time to answer, I wish you'd call me.

Jack

monotony and low pay. The job is filing photographs in the library of a large Philadelphia newspaper. Now, Mr. Weisberg, everything I tell you about my job and the idea I have is strictly to offer to help you, and is <u>absolutely</u> <u>confidential</u>, of course.

In this newspaper library are the 26 volumes. I have no time during working hours, but I have stayed each evening to look at them on my own time, after work. I have also looked at photos in the Kennedy and Oswald files. Should your book be reprinted, and should you want particular photos, maybe I could dig them out and lend them to you, although it would, of course, be absolutely essential for me to get them back <u>immediately</u> to replace them in the files. Now, you may not even <u>want</u> photos, or you may

already have access to all you want. I don't know.

I do know that a lot of photos in a book are one hell of a good selling-point, though. So, this is just a suggestion on my part. I think Exhibits 59 and 60 might be an excellent addition to your book. I know we have glossies in the file.

You can imagine the trouble I could get into making this offer. So, it must remain confidential. If you do want any, I only ask that you supply mailing envelopes and the postage so that they can be duplicated by you, and then immediately returned to me so that I can replace them.

Or, perhaps, if you could arrange to come to Philly some evening, I could get permission to bring you into the Library to look

at the photos. If you did this, you could simply tell me which ones you want, and I'd dig them back out and send them to you.

Maybe you are not interested at all, but at least now I have made the offer. I believe in your purpose, and agree with you — on top of that, I have the deepest admiration for you and the courage and determination you have shown merely by putting the book out. This is my only motivation. To be of assistance. I only wish I could have helped you from the very beginning — I am no polished writer, but maybe I could have helped in research, at least. I surely wish I could write, myself.

On your radio and TV appearances in Philly and New York, respectively, I heard people ask you your own opinion as to who was behind the